

Urban-ward Migration and Livelihood Situations: The Case of Dukem Town, Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia

Terefe Degefa¹ and Bikile Zelalem²

Abstract

The main objective of this article is to examine the extent to which urban-ward migration has improved the livelihood situations of in-migrant population in Dukem Town. On the basis of primary cross-sectional data/information generated through mixed-methods of data collection and analysis, the article indicates that the livelihood situation of migrant households is mixed influenced by social networks, education, experiences and being urban origin making improvement in livelihoods context specific. These results therefore challenge theories and assumptions that qualify urban-ward migration as a means of improving livelihoods. The expansion of socio-economic infrastructures/services and investments in labour absorbing enterprises both in rural and urban areas are crucial development trajectories in reducing the magnitude of urban-ward migration and improve the livelihoods of urban in-migrants.

Keywords: Urban-ward migration, livelihoods, livelihood changes, housing conditions, working conditions, urban in-migrants

¹ Assistant Professor, College of Development Studies, Addis Ababa University

² Misrak Poly Technic College, Addis Ababa; email: bikisha2013@gmail.com

Introduction

As a proximate determinant of demographic variable joined by fertility and mortality, migration remains to be an interesting area of concern for planners and development experts. It denotes the movement of people across space while urban-ward migration represents only one of the possible forms of internal migration, which redistributes population between rural and urban areas and within urban areas as well. Urban-ward migration has played a significant role in the process of urbanization everywhere in the world. Almost half of the world population lives in cities and has been rising steadily by around one million people every year (Bahns, 2005). Unlike the experiences of currently developed countries, the process of urbanization presently taking place in developing countries is not so much due to rapid industrialization. Rather, it is the consequence of growing population pressure on land in the rural areas (Asfar, 2003; Kassahun, 2000), and thus urbanization takes place both with and without industrialization (Mohammed, 2007; Kojima, 1996).

In view of the high growth rates of urban population and high level of urbanization, urban-ward migration appears to have been the major component of a growing urban population in many developing countries in the past as well as at present, and not a natural population increase caused by the difference between fertility and mortality in urban areas. Rural to urban migration is the single most important factor contributing to rapid population growth of towns and cities in Ethiopia (Abeje, 2012). The reasons for urban-ward migration can be grasped and professed with regard to the well grounded theoretical foundation of the pull and push factors pioneered by Ravenstein (1885), which seems to work perfectly in today's world as it worked during the late 19th Century. The push factors include poor living conditions (relatively low wages and lack of employment opportunities) in rural areas caused in large part by rapid population growth and the consequent excess labour supply and the pull factors include better living conditions in cities (higher wages, better employment opportunities, and superior social services) and all rooted in economic concerns. Nevertheless, migration to cities can also occur even if the expected income in the cities is lower than the income in the rural areas (Timalsina, 2007),

which could be the outcome of strong aspirations instilled in the minds of the migrants about city life in the years to come.

Being surrounded by large agricultural populace with bulging unemployed youth category, it is logical to believe that Dukem Town is the place of destination for those who seek to change their livelihoods, strategy often influenced by the experiences of migrants who have kept in touch with either their kin or friends in the rural areas and returnees or even visitors (Pankhurst and Feleke, 2005). Dukem is located in the Special Zone of Oromia Regional State at a distance of 37 kilometres from Addis Ababa, between Gelan and Bishoftu towns. Dukem is administered by the district (Woreda) of Akaki. It had about 8,380 people in 1994 and 24,222 in 2008 (Oromia Urban Planning Institute (OUPI), 2008).

Since the recent past, Dukem Town is being selected as a place of destination by investors that stemmed from various reasons; favourable natural environment, location on the Djibouti – Addis Ababa Railway and short distance from Addis Ababa. Following the 1996 reform of the town, the increasing interests of investors has significantly been responded to by the city administration. Accordingly, about 415 investors have acquired 515.88 hectare of land and invested about birr 15 billion. It is estimated that this relatively big investment has led to the creation of job opportunities for about 15,736 people (Nadi Dukem, 2013).

This article therefore attempts to generate evidences on this vital subject of urban-ward migration with a view to contribute to a better understanding of the livelihood situations of the in-migrants (interchangeably referred to as migrants) of the small towns in Ethiopia and also beyond. It is organized into six sections: statement of the problem, objective of the study, review of related literature, methodology, results and discussions, and conclusions and recommendations.

Statement of the Problem

Ethiopia is one of the least urbanized countries of the world where 16% of its population resides in urban areas (MoFED, 2006). But the rate of Ethiopian urbanization is one of the highest in the world, i.e., 3.8% annually

(Ethiopia Demographic Profile, 2012). The rapid growth of urban population in Ethiopia and in many other developing countries has been largely due to rural-urban migration, which almost makes up half of urban population growth (Abeje, 2012; CSA, 2011; Feyera and Terefe, 2011; Kebede, 1994).

It is apparent that the basic reasons for the drift of large number of people from rural to the urban areas are the rural push factors such as rural population pressure, resource and environmental degradation and social and political problems. In addition, the relative improvement of different facilities and better living conditions in urban areas compared to rural areas is the main pull factors. However, the pace of urbanization or the tide of migration to urban areas which is mainly triggered by rural push factors is consistently higher than the capacity of new job openings and the provision of housing and other social services and amenities. Its effects are felt in widespread urban unemployment, over-crowded housing and severe shortage of public amenities. Adequate understanding and knowledge of the causes and consequences of urban-ward migration and its impacts on destination areas are considered as prerequisites for effective urban management and the implementation of rural development policies (Gashaw, 2002).

Currently, the size of population is alarmingly increasing in small towns of Ethiopia. Dukem Town is one of such hotspots in receiving migrants and showing high population growth rate as a result. According to information obtained from Dukem Municipal Office, the annual growth rate of the population in 2012 was 7.8%, almost twice the national urban population growth rate, contributed mainly by urban-ward migrants. The vast majority of the migrants originated from rural areas that were kicked out by the push factors and attracted by the pull factors briefly noted above.

Objective of the Study

The main objective of the study is to examine the extent to which urban-ward migration has influenced the livelihood situations of in-migrants in Dukem Town. It also assessed factors that motivate people to migrate to the town to compare the two (pre and post migration) livelihood situations of the in-migrants to Dukem.

Review of Related Literature

Causes and consequences of migration

Migration has several causes as well as various consequences, which are in fact context specific. Understanding the livelihood situations of the migrant population therefore requires a good knowledge of the causes and the consequences as well as the contexts within which migration as a means of livelihood transformation takes place.

The causes of any kind of migration differ from individual to individual and from community to community and encompass such factors as ecological pressure, economic incentives, psychological motivation, political situations, etc. (Qin, 2010; Lindsay, 1985). The importance of these factors does change across space and over a period of time. The causes of migration are generally traced to economic, socio-cultural and environmental determinants. Economic explanations centre on the search for better opportunities of income and employment; socio cultural explanations centre on the desire of migrants to break away from traditional constraints and inequalities. Environmental explanations centre on the lure of the cities and migration induced by disaster, displacement and demographic pressures or imbalances (Sundari, 2005).

Migration is further considered to be a strategic household response to scarcity and poverty conditions and a means of reducing vulnerability and increase income and investment (Smit, 2011). In most instances, it is the flow of remittance as poverty alleviation strategy (Haas, 2007) that gives the final kick to out-migration. In practical aspects, various studies demonstrate that remittances are increasingly important for migrant sending areas and have been found to be the major source of income for farming households in rural areas (Wills, 2010). Remittances generated from migrants could be a powerful tool for overcoming households' income risks and hence noted to be a kind of income insurance of the sending households (Stark *et al.*, 1985). Evidence also attests to the fact that in areas with high population density the out-migration of people may result in the reduction of underemployment and less pressure on natural resources serving as a

protection mechanism of the livelihoods of the sending rural households (IFAD, 2008).

The case of Bangladesh, for instance, demonstrates that 'rural-urban migration and hence urbanization in Bangladesh is poverty driven, caused by extreme entitlement contraction among a sizeable segment of the population, who happen to be among the marginalized peasantry and the landless poor' (Kabir, 2010:321). Focusing on the case of seasonal migration in Ethiopia, a group of researchers came to the consensus that shortage of farmland, debt, lack of viable non-farm activities locally, and the desire to earn additional income are the major reasons for migration. Also, social networks and information flows are important factors in migration (Zelege *et al.*, 2010) such that people come to the decision to migrate to other areas to be part of the beneficiaries of available social services and amenities. Besides, many problems related to environmental, social, economic, cultural and policy issues, especially those connected to the agricultural sector are noted as the driving causes of out-migration. For example, the attraction of urban areas, mostly to one primate city like Addis Ababa are largely economic and hence the result of rural and urban income and quality of life differentials, dictated by better jobs, markets, goods and services in more concentrated ways (EIA, 1999/2000). However, the direction of migration keeps on changing given time as a result of the creation of pull factors in other areas. It is noted that before the early 1970s, Addis Ababa was the most important urban destination for Ethiopians moving from the rural areas. After 1974 a shift to other Ethiopian cities occurred (Berhanu, 2011). Scholars (Dessalegn, 1984; Assefa, 1984; Kebede, 1994; Markos, 2001), mention many economic factors as the major causes of the movement of people from the agricultural sector to urban centres in Ethiopia. These factors include scarcity of land and land fragmentation due to increasing population pressure and/or unfavourable land tenure; inadequate agricultural inputs and low per-capita production; absence of farm oxen; improper farming practices, deforestation, overgrazing, over cultivation and consequent environmental degradation; environmental crisis and the consequent famine and a set of many other related factors.

In addition to the economic factors that fostered migration in Ethiopia, non-economic reasons related to socio-cultural problems prevail. Such issues as early marriage/abduction, death of spouse, divorce and cultural barriers to remarriage in some parts of the country are cases in point. Most migrants are young female, who aimed at escaping from different cultural and social bondage faced in most regions of the country (Kebede, 1994).

The consequences of migration are possibly as diverse as the causes of migration. Whatever factor causes a given migration, the consequences are felt both at the place of origin and destination (Mohamed, 2006). In general, the consequences include impacts on population size, composition and structure, economic productivity, income inequality, access to social services, family and kinship structure, social roles as well as changes in values and norms. In a slightly another perspective, it might be worthy to quote Kabir's (2010:321) unequivocal conclusion regarding some aspects of the consequences of urban-ward migration in Pakistan:

The migration of the rural poor to the urban centres has caused a direct transmission of rural poverty and backwardness to the towns, engendering the process of 'ruralization' of the urban centres. The pull factors, which attract the rural people and induce them to migration to urban location, are in a large measure the direct or indirect results of government's development policy and efforts, that [have] always been biased towards the urban areas.

Not all migrants are subjected to similar problem as well. For instance, indigenous peoples that migrate to urban areas face particular and often additional challenges, most prominently unemployment, limited access to services and inadequate housing. In addition, indigenous peoples in urban areas may experience discrimination and have difficulties in sustaining their language, identity, culture and educating future generations which can result in a loss of indigenous heritage and values (United Nations Permanent Forum for Indigenous Issues, nd).

Migrants are destined to different types of consequences some of which are detrimental to life while others are threatening the very aspiration of the people on the move. The main problems that migrants face concern lack of

low cost housing, physical insecurity, skewed distribution of the delivery of basic services and subsequent health problems (Asfar, 2003). Migrants can have difficulties adjusting to being away from home and missing family and relatives or friends whilst most experience financial problems and homelessness (Waddington, 2003). Over one-third of the population of cities of developing countries has the possibility of living in squatter and slum settlements (Todaro, 1989). Overcrowding and congestion, strain on urban social services, rising food costs, worsening air and water quality and increasing violence, prostitution and diseases are other important documented consequences of urban-ward migration (Adepoju, 1991). High housing costs and regulations that make it harder for migrants to rent houses in the cities usually push them to suburban areas where social services are inadequate and security concerns remain imminent (Zhao, 1999).

Other perspectives do exist that qualify urban-ward migration with positive tone but also make note of the fundamental circumstances required for policymaking and actual practice. In this perspective, Mohammed's (2007:1) incessant remarks illuminate some insights:

'...rural-urban linkages would be enhanced by improvements in the livelihood strategies of the people through supporting urban-based non-farm activities and informed activities in small towns, improving the labour absorptive capacity of business sectors in towns, discouraging public monopolies in input marketing and distribution, supporting agricultural intensifications, strengthening physical and market infrastructure, improving the financial sector, and supporting the development of agro-processing industries.'

Given the above, urban-ward migration does not come upfront to resolve individual problems of unemployment or poverty at least for a large size of the migrant population. Likewise, it stands far away from being a failure. Success therefore depends on a number of factors such as individuals' ability to adjust to the new environment, education and experiences as well as networking. It is useful to understand that migrants undergo social changes, self-transformation, and must be prepared to quickly accept new life styles and develop individual independence (Mohamed, 2006). Otherwise, there is a high likelihood that migrants become easy prey to the yet unknown predator of the destination areas. The study therefore

examines factors that trigger in-migrants to make migration decision given a number of issues awaiting them at Dukem Town.

Methodology

Sources and types of data

The study relied on both quantitative data and qualitative information collected from various sources utilizing selected techniques, and it is mixed method in approach. Survey questionnaire was designed to collect quantitative data from respondent sample households while qualitative information was collected from focus group discussions (FGDs), key informants, and case studies. FGDs comprising seven in-migrants were organized and conducted in each *kebele* by including representatives from varying ages and both sexes, which means there was one FGD for each *kebele*. The three FGDs were denoted as FGD – one, FGD – two and FGD - three. Key informants were selected from sector government offices, namely communication, youth and sports as well as town police offices and *kebeles*. Finally, two case studies were conducted; one on the successful and the other on the unsuccessful in-migrants in terms of livelihood improvements. FGDs were helpful in generating general information about the community, and key informants in providing in-depth information related to a given context whilst case studies were instrumental in documenting individual life experiences. Three sets of guidelines/checklists were designed for each of the three sources of data/information and utilized accordingly in the process of data collection. Secondary data were also collected from relevant sources such as government statistical reports, plan documents, scientific publications, etc.

Sampling design

This research employed both probability and non-probability sampling methods. In the selection of sample respondents, probability sampling was applied whereas in the selection of focus group discussants, key informants and case studies, non-probability sampling method was employed.

Sampling techniques

Sample size was determined using the following formula (Julie, 2004) for it appeals to the very nature of the study:

$$N = \frac{P(1-p)(Z\alpha/2)^2}{E^2}$$

Where N: is the sample size

Z: is the standard normal value corresponding to the desired level of confidence.

E: is error of precision.

P: is estimated proportion of an attribute that is present in the population.

Assumptions

Data on migration was not available and therefore to obtain maximum sample size, P is assumed to be 0.5; margin of acceptable error E = 5% and with confidence interval of 95% ,

$$N = \frac{0.5(1-0.5)(Z\alpha/2)^2}{0.05^2} = 384$$

For non-response error a 10% of 384 of contingency (38) is added to the sample making total sample size 422 migrant households.

These 422 respondent sample households were selected from the three *kebeles* (local administrative units) called 01, Gogecha and Koticha. Migrants who have stayed from one to ten years were considered in this study following the Central Statistical Agency's consideration of in-migrants as residents after ten years of stay in the destination areas (CSA, 2011).

Sampling procedure and data collection

Out of four *kebeles* of the town, three were selected purposively due to the fact that the vast majority of in-migrants settle in these three *kebeles* that are relatively newer as compared to the fourth *kebele* which is older and more urbanized one. Migrant households were identified from non-migrant households using the registry book of the three sample *kebeles* in consultation with *kebele* leaders and at times with the households themselves. The respondent sample households (422) constituted about 13.56% of the total migrant households of the three *kebeles* (3,114), and were selected randomly by applying proportional probability sampling technique included in the sample (Table 1). Only 407 sample households were willing to participate in the study, and hence there was a response rate of about 96.5%. Data were collected from each sample respondent on the basis of survey questionnaire which was pre-tested and revised prior to data collection. Four government development workers who know the local situation were selected, trained and involved in data collection as enumerators.

Table 1. Distribution of Sample Migrant Households

Kebele	Number of household heads	Number of sample household heads	Percentage of the sample
01	1215	165	39.1
Gogecha	999	136	32.2
Koticha	900	121	28.7
Total	3114	422	100

Source: Own Survey, 2013

Methods of Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics was used as the main tool of analysis for quantitative data while qualitative information was analyzed by applying the coding and categorizing approach and evidences generated from the two methods of analysis were utilized in complementary ways to explain and interpret particular issues of the study. The two evidences also served as a means of triangulating some data for the purpose of verification.

Results and Discussions

Age and sex distribution of the migrants

Age and sex are among the most determinant factors in most migration streams (Clark, 1986; CSA, 2007; 2011; Helmsing, 2000). As can be seen from Table 2, about 64% of the migrants were below age 30, around 33.9% were between ages 25-29, believed to be consistent with what Clark (1986) pointed out. This may be explained by the fact that the young are less tied to families and social responsibilities than the older ones to stay at their birth places. It also appears that the young are capable of adapting to the urban environment. In general, the evidences show that migration to *Dukem Town* is highly age selective. Regarding sex aspect, about 41.76% (170 out of 407) of the in-migrants are females and 83.5% of these came to the town from rural areas.

Table 2. Number and Percentage Distribution of Migrants by Age, Sex and Place of Birth

Age group	Place of Birth and Sex*						Total
	Urban		Rural		All		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
15-19	2 (3.1)	1 (3.5)	4 (2.3)	4 (2.8)	6 (2.5)	5 (2.9)	11 (2.7)
20-24	9 (13.8)	10 (35.7)	61 (35.5)	33 (23.2)	70 (29.5)	43 (25.3)	113 (27.7)
25-29	25 (38.5)	9 (32.1)	44 (25.5)	60 (42.2)	69 (29.1)	69 (40.5)	138 (33.9)
30-34	14 (21.5)	5 (17.8)	44 (25.5)	28 (19.7)	58 (24.5)	33 (19.4)	91 (22.40)
35-39	8 (12.3)	2 (7.2)	13 (7.6)	15 (10.5)	21 (8.8)	17 (10)	38 (9.3)
40-44	7 (10.53)	1 (3.5)	6 (3.5)	2 (1.4)	13 (5.04)	3 (1.76)	16 (3.73)
Total	65 (100)	28 (100)	172 (100)	142 (100)	237 (100)	170 (100)	407 (100)

* Figures in parentheses are percentages.

Source: Own Survey, 2013

Educational characteristics

As illustrated in Table 3, about 4.1% of the in-migrants were illiterate while the vast majority (about 95.9%) had an educational level above primary (89% being above university). The fact that about 44% of the in-migrants had diploma or degree before migrating out reveals that the propensity to migrate is directly related to educational attainment which is consistent with what other sources came up with (Newman, 1984; Gugler, 1988; Todaro, 1989). This has to do with the better likelihood of obtaining jobs in the town on the one hand and the decision to break away from the difficult life of the place of origin on the other. A little difference in the level of educational attainment between migrants of rural and urban origin can be explained partly by lack of schools and opportunities in rural Ethiopia.

Table 3. Number and Percentage Distribution of Migrants by Educational Status, Sex and Place of Birth

Level of Education	Place of Birth and Sex						Total
	Urban		Rural		All		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Illiterate	-	3 (10.7)	7 (4)	7 (4.9)	7 (2.9)	10 (5.8)	17 (4.1)
Primary school	-	-	10 (5.8)	17 (11.9)	10 (4.2)	17 (10)	27 (6.6)
Secondary school	20 (30.76)	11 (39.3)	77 (44.7)	49 (34.5)	97 (40.92)	60 (35.3)	157 (38.6)
Secondary + Training	3 (4.6)	2 (7.1)	14 (8.1)	6 (4.2)	17 (7.2)	8 (4.7)	25 (6.2)
College or University	42 (64.6)	12 (42.85)	64 (37.2)	63 (44.3)	106 (44.7)	75 (44.1)	181 (44.4)
Total	65 (100)	28 (100)	172 (100)	142 (100)	237 (100)	170 (100)	407 (100)

*Figures in parentheses are percentages.

Source: Own Survey, 2013

Causes of migration

The prime factor of migrating to urban areas is to get employed as the case of many (47.9%) in-migrants show although about 2.9% came to the town from rural origin due to environmental factors such as drought, famine and land degradation, about 15% due to social integration while 7.9% migrated as a result of marriage. About 19.7% and 3.18% (rural origin) came to the town to access better infrastructure and school, respectively. As often expected the causes of out-migration for those who came from rural areas are different from those whose place of origin was urban. For the former, environmental factors such as problems related to agriculture and access to schools are noted to be dominant (Table 4). In other words, the agglomeration of different commercial, industrial investments, service

giving organizations and other facilities in urban centres attracts many people from both rural and less beneficial small towns to the bigger towns (Becker *et al.*, 1994; Haas, 2007; Wills, 2010).

Table 4. Percentage Distribution of Migrants by the Causes of Migration and Place of Birth

Main causes to migrate to Dukem	Place of Birth					
	Urban		Rural		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Urban job opportunity	54	58.06	141	44.90	195	47.90
Social integration	10	10.75	47	14.96	61	15
Lack of access to infrastructure	9	9.67	71	22.60	80	19.70
Due to marriage	9	9.67	23	7.32	32	7.90
Environmental factors	-	-	12	3.82	12	2.90
Lack of access to school	-	-	10	3.18	10	2.45
Lack of land for cultivation	-	-	10	3.18	10	2.45
Job transfers	11	11.83	-	-	11	2.70
Total	93	100	314	100	407	100

Source: Own Survey, 2013

Consequences of migration on the livelihoods of migrants

Employment and nature of work

The status of migrants' employment shows that about 27.80%, 27.50% and 22.46% of migrants are engaged in self-employment, in governmental and non-governmental organizations, respectively. Some migrants (19.70%) are employed in private organizations. As a whole, about 69.50% of migrants are working in governmental, non-governmental and formal private organizations. Thus, migrants in Dukem have high participation rate in formal organizations. This might be linked to the high level of education of the migrants. The participation of rural born migrants in government organizations (27.07%) is a little bit less than those urban born and urban to urban migrants (28.94%). In contrast, the participation of migrants of rural origin in self-employment activities (32.08%) is higher than those migrants

of urban origin (14.47%) (Table 5). In other words, rural-born migrants are less capable of getting government employment due to their low level of educational attainment than their urban counterparts.

Table 5. Percentage Distribution of Migrants by Type of Employment, Nature of Current Work and Place of Birth

Type of Employment	Place of Birth					
	Urban		Rural		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Self	11	14.47	77	32.08	88	27.80
Private	22	28.94	41	17.07	63	19.93
NGO	20	26.30	51	21.25	71	22.46
Government	22	28.94	65	27.07	87	27.50
Not stated	1	1.3	6	2.50	7	2.20
Total	76	100	240	100	316*	100
Nature of current work						
Permanent	34	44.7	98	40.8	132	41.70
Temporary	27	35.5	84	35	111	35.10
Seasonal	12	15.78	42	17.5	54	17.08
Causal	0	-	4	1.66	4	1.26
Not stated	3	3.9	12	5	15	4.70
Total	76	100	240	100	316	100

* The remaining (407-316 = 91) respondents were not employed.

Source: Own Survey, 2013.

As the results of the study show, 41.70%, 35.10% and 17.08% of the total in-migrants are engaged in permanent, temporary and seasonal jobs, respectively. Furthermore, migrants of urban origin (44.70%) have better access to permanent employment than migrants of rural origin (40.80%).

It is indicated (Table 6) that about 22.35% of the migrants earn an average monthly income of less than birr 500 while about 24.57% earn birr 501-

1000. Only 20.14% of migrants earn a monthly income of more than birr 2,000. The monthly income of migrants who came from rural areas is lower than those who came from urban areas. In other words, only 14.37% of the former earn more than birr 2,000 monthly as compared to their urban counterpart (39%), which has to do with the experiences and established networks and support mechanisms. Moreover, urban born migrants have relatively better level of education which allowed them to get employed in formal sectors such as in government and non-governmental organizations (Table 3). Findings further revealed that about 54.29% of the migrants are unable to save money simply because it is inadequate to sustain their subsistence requirements (FGDs). Also, about 74.44% of the migrants reported that their monthly income is not enough to support the family.

Table 6. Percentage Distribution of Migrants by Average Monthly Income, Saving and Place of Birth

Amount of Monthly Income	Place of Birth					
	Urban		Rural		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
< 500	13	13.97	78	24.84	91	22.35
501-1000	10	10.75	90	28.66	100	24.57
1001-1500	13	13.97	64	20.38	77	18.91
1501-2000	20	21.5	37	11.78	57	14
>2000	37	39.78	45	14.33	82	20.14
Total	93	100	314	100	407	100
Can you save?						
Yes	59	63.44	127	40.44	186	45.7
No	34	36.55	187	59.55	221	54.29
Total	93	100	314	100	407	100
Is your income enough?						
Yes	47	50.53	57	18.15	104	25.55
No	46	49.47	257	81.8	303	74.44
Total	93	100	314	100	407	100

Source: Own Survey, 2013.

Housing, housing facilities and amenities

Adequacy of housing

It is observed that that about 47.9% of the households whatever household size they might have (1-6 and above) live in one room. About 14.25% and 10.07% of the households live in two and three rooms, respectively. Thus, about half of the migrant households in Dukem Town live in overcrowded situations (Table 7). The implication of this overcrowding to health, psychological and social status of the residents is quite enormous. According to an FGD participant, housing problems are so serious that there are tremendous effects to health, privacy and social interaction. As a result, confidence is eroded and conflicts are everyday encounters of survival (April 20, 2013).

Table 7. Percentage Distribution of Migrants by Household Size and Number of Rooms

		Size of Household Members			Total
		1-3	4-5	>6	
Number of Rooms	One	140	38	17	195 (47.9)
	Two	28	26	4	58 (14.25)
	Three	22	13	6	41 (10.07)
	Four	10	29	4	43 (10.56)
	Five	14	17	2	33 (8.10)
	≥ Six	7	17	13	37 (9.09)
	Total	231	140	46	407(100)

Source: Own Survey, 2013.

A comparison of owner and rented housing tenure (Table 8) demonstrates that the majority of the migrants (64.87%) live in rented housing while only 35.13% live in own housing. It is also shown that there is no significant variation between migrants with regard to their place of origin in terms of owner and rented housing. Likewise, about 60.8% of the migrants that are of rural origin and 49.49% of the urban origin live in the houses that are not adequate for their family. The remaining households (50.3% of urban origin and 39.2% of rural origin) live in houses that are adequate for their family members. In general, more than half of the migrants (58.2%) live in houses

that are inadequate for their family. That means that shortage of housing is a predominant challenge with its diverse implications, which is the result of weak economic power to build and/or rent adequate houses.

Table 8. Percentage Distribution of Migrants by Housing Tenure and Place of Birth

Housing Tenure	Place of Birth					
	Urban		Rural		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Owned	33	35.48	110	35.03	143	35.13
Rented	60	64.52	204	64.97	264	64.87
Total	93	100	314	100	407	100
Adequacy of the house for the family						
Yes	47	50.3	123	39.2	170	41.8
No	46	49.46	191	60.8	237	58.2
Total	93	100	314	100	407	100

Source: Own Survey, 2013

Availability of kitchen, toilet and shower facilities

Housing facilities such as kitchen, toilet and bath are useful indicators in evaluating the living condition of migrant households. As depicted in Table 9, a good size of the migrants (61.17%) has separate kitchen facilities though the remaining (38.82%) do not. About 28.78% of the migrants have private and 70.27% shared toilet facilities, and 30.7% private and 60.4% shared shower facilities. On balance, there are more shared housing facilities than privately owned ones. This is a major cause of conflict among residents. The findings also revealed that there is small variation between migrants of urban and rural origin with regard to access to shower facilities. As shown, large size of the migrants share housing facilities and others do not have them at all (for instance, 9.82% have neither toilet nor shower facilities) and as a result they cause environmental pollutions are subjected to health problems.

Table 9. Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Kitchen Facility, Type of Bathing and Toilet Facilities

Availability of Kitchen Facilities	Place of Birth					
	Urban		Rural		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Yes	58	62.36	191	60.82	249	61.17
No	35	37.64	123	39.18	158	38.82
Total	93	100	314	100	407	100
Type of toilet						
Private	25	26.88	92	29.48	117	28.78
Shared	66	70.96	220	70.5	286	70.27
Have no toilet	2	2.15	2	0.64	4	0.98
Total	93	100	314	100	407	100
Type of shower facility						
Private	26	27.97	99	31.5	125	30.7
Shared	63	67.74	183	58.28	246	60.4
Have no shower	4	4.3	32	10.19	36	8.84
Total	93	100	314	100	407	100

Source: Own Survey, 2013.

Access to urban services

Access to public services such as water and electricity are major indicators of the living conditions of households. The supply of water through pipes is recognized as the most effective means of protecting it from pollution and of ensuring its purity. The result of the study showed that about 48.2% of the migrants had their own water meters. About 26% of the migrants used public tap while 17.2% and 8% depend on other households and shared meters, respectively. One can conclude that more than half of the migrants do not own water meters. Moreover, the majority of the migrants (74.94%) have their own electric meters whereas 25.1% of them use shared meters. In general, migrants get electric supply either from their own metres or from shared ones (Table 10); this is, as compared to water supply, in a better situation.

Table 10. Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Source of Water and Electric Supply

Source of water	Respondents	
	Number	%
Own Meter	196	48.2
Public tap	106	26
From other household	70	17.2
Shared meter	35	8
Total	407	100
Access to electricity		
Yes	305	74.94
No	102	25.06
Total	407	100

Source: Own Survey, 2013.

It is also revealed that about 40.3%, 28.26% and 28% of the migrants use charcoal, firewood and electricity for cooking, respectively. As can be observed, most migrants rely on biomass based energy which is unwelcoming both for health and environmental considerations as there are clear signs of deforestation in Dukem and its environs. Most migrant households dispose wastes relatively in proper ways (36.7% in holes and 45.9% through waste disposers). Nevertheless, about 17.4% of the migrants dispose wastes around the road or everywhere; this certainly poses health and environmental threat as well as reduce the beauty of the area. The fact that a good number of the migrants hand over their wastes to disposers might indicate that there is lack of better sites or mechanisms of disposing wastes (Table 11). The environmental implication of this problem is considerable.

Table 11. Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Materials used for Cooking and Types of Waste Disposal

Materials for Cooking	Respondents	
	No.	%
Firewood	115	28.26
Electricity	114	28
Charcoal	164	40.3
Biogas	14	3.4
Total	407	100
Type of waste disposal		
In holes	149	36.7
Waste disposers	187	45.9
By the road	49	12
Everywhere	22	5.4
Total	407	100

Source: Own Survey, 2013.

A Comparison of the Livelihood Situations of Migrants before and after Migration

This section specifically focuses on a comparison of the livelihood situations of migrants before and after their migration, relying on such factors as working conditions, income, education, housing, access to urban transportation and health care. As shown in Table 12, about 25.3% of the migrants reported that their working conditions have improved. About 12.8% and 58.9% enjoyed improvement in their income and access to telephone, respectively, while 77% of have seen significant changes in transportation facilities as compared to their experiences before migration. Similarly, about 56.1% and 35.1% of the migrants noted to have accessed better health care and housing, respectively, and about 13.3% have succeeded in obtaining better education though about 69.4% have not been able to succeed in this regard. A further examination of their livelihood situation indicates that about 38.9% of the migrants have enjoyed improvements in overall livelihood situations as a result of moving to Dukem Town. Nevertheless, livelihood situations have not changed for about 47.2% of the migrants and about 13.7% could not even manage to maintain the type of livelihood they had prior to migration.

Table 12. Percentage Distribution of Migrants by Current Status of Livelihood Situations Compared with the Period before Migration

Conditions	Current Status as Compared to the Period before Migration					
	Improved		Worsened		Same	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Type of work	103	25.3	50	12.28	254	62.4
Income	50	12.28	52	12.7	305	74.9
Education	54	13.26	70	17.2	283	69.54
Access to telephone	240	58.9	6	1.47	161	39.55
Access to housing	143	35.1	100	2.45	164	40.29
Access to urban transportation	314	77.14	-	-	93	22.85
Access to health care	205	50.36	56	13.75	146	35.8
General living conditions	159	39.1	56	13.7	192	47.2

Source: Own Survey, 2013.

The two particular cases studied, one from successful and the other from unsuccessful migrants reveal the rather mixed kind of livelihood situations encountered by the migrants in Dukem Town. Following is a remark by the successful migrant:

Immediately after my arrival at Dukem, I was in a difficult situation and life was too hard to survive. But I worked seriously using all my energy, skill and time. It was so much exhaustive and at times frustrating since you have nobody to help you. With time, I developed relations with people, obtained experiences on how to struggle to continue surviving and thus I have passed through multiple challenges like preparing and distributing 'injera' in Dukem as well as in Akaki area including selling materials and goods to shop owners. But today thank God, I have one hotel and two shops and also I have created job opportunity for 15 people (Case Study One, April 18, 2013).

On the other hand, the unsuccessful migrant makes the following statements:

My living conditions have been so difficult because of inadequate income and I failed to pay for my daily subsistence. My education was low and I could not get advice or any kind of assistance to get job and improve my income. As a result, I decided to work on two shift basis; I am employed in a private organization during day time and engaged in commercial sex work (prostitution) during night time. I have a fear to go back to my birth place because most of my relatives consider me as if I am employed and could not understand about my living conditions. The fact that I have been involved in commercial sex to get money left me but with psychological distress in my life (Case Study Two, April 20, 2013).

Interview with a key informant also shows a similar livelihood situation:

Migrants have several problems. For instance, they don't have ID cards that clearly show their identities. Due to this, they make different crimes such as stealing, quarrelling with normal people, drinking alcohol and disturbing, chewing chat and smoking cannabis and the like that have been creating serious problems to the society (Key Informant One, April 16, 2013).

Generally, the results of this study demonstrate that the livelihood situations of more than half of the migrants have not changed for the better (for 13.7% it got worsened and for 47.2% of them experienced unimproved livelihoods) while about 39.1% of the migrants have been able to enjoy improved livelihoods after moving to the town (Table 12). But it is obvious that there has been increased pressure on and demand for urban services in otherwise small but growing town of Dukem. On the other hand, there are theories and assumptions that concluded that urban-ward migration can improve the living conditions of the migrants in developing countries (Bethlehem, 2005; Dana and Hunnes, 2013; Haan, 2000; Dejene, 2005; Ells and Harris, 2004; Gebrehiwot and Fekadu, 2012; Kabir and Haider, 2010; Waddington, 2003). The findings of this study nevertheless reveal mixed results of livelihood situations, i.e., improvement for some, no change for others and worsened situations for the remaining urban in-migrants and hence the findings challenge the hitherto held theories and assumptions.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Urban-ward migration is one of the factors that play significant roles in speeding up the process of urbanization in Ethiopia as elsewhere in the developing world. Its contributions in terms of increasing the size of urban population, expanding urban areas and contributing to the socio-economic development are quite enormous. On the other hand, people migrate to urban areas in search of job opportunities and thereby improve their livelihood situations. It is against this background that the study upon which this article is based is framed with the objective of examining the livelihood situations of in-migrants to Dukem Town. This town could be considered an example of small towns of Ethiopia with much accelerated growth triggered by the increasing size of population resulting from in-migration as observed from a change in the size of the population of Dukem Town from 8,380 in 1994 (CSA, 1999) to 34,777 in 2012 (Nadi Dukem, 2012).

The results also show that the majority of the migrants in Dukem moved to the town mainly for economic reasons. Some of the migrants (39.1%) had succeeded in improving their livelihood situations while most migrants (60.9%) did not, as compared to their livelihood situation in their place of origin. Those who managed to improve their livelihoods have better experiences and education, established social networks and their last place of origin was urban, and hence improvement in livelihoods is context specific. The results further show that about 74.4% of the sample households earn inadequate income, 47.9% live in poor housing conditions, 38.8% have no separate kitchen, 69% have no private shower, and 71% have no private toilet. Moreover, only about 25.3% of the sample households reported to have secured improved working conditions whilst about 58.9%, 56.1% and 77% have access to better telephone connection, health and transportation services, respectively, as compared to their place of origin. These findings do not corroborate theories and assumptions with premises that urban-ward migration is an important milestone in improving the livelihood situations of urban in-migrants.

Since the overwhelming majority of the migrants to Dukem Town are 'economic migrants', and since this town could be considered a microcosm

of the larger and fast growing urban centres of Ethiopia as a whole, great attention needs to be given at macro (national) level to address the causes of urban-ward migration. These causes are rooted in both place of origin and destination as push and pull factors, respectively. And both have to be addressed equally. The first attention to be given has to do with the provision of clear information to the people particularly to the rural youth who are potential migrants about the challenges of urban life so that they will be able to make informed decisions. Nevertheless, the expansion of socio-economic infrastructures and services and adequate investments in labour absorbing enterprises in both rural and urban areas are crucial development trajectories in reducing urban-ward migration, on the one hand, and improving the livelihood condition of urban in-migrants, on the other.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to extend their appreciation to the two anonymous reviewers who made useful comments which helped to revise the original version of the article. The contributions of our respondents at Dukem Town, the municipal staff and enumerators are also gratefully acknowledged.

References

- Abeje Berhanu. 2012. *The Rural-Urban Nexus in Migration and Livelihoods Diversification: A Case Study of East Esté Wereda and Bahir Dar Town, Amhara Region, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, OSSREA.*
- Adepoju, A. 1991. *Introduction to Population Studies, Demographic Lecture Manual, Seriel No. 2.* New York.
- Asfar, Rita. 2003. *Internal Migration and the Development Nexus: the case of Bangladesh.* Paper Presented on a Regional Conference on Migration, Development and Pro-Policy Choices in Asia, Organized by Refugee and Migratory Research Unit, Bangladesh, and the Department for International Development, UK, 22-24, Dhaka, Bangladesh.
- Assefa Damte. 1984. *Urbanization in Ethiopia: Pre and Post Revolution Experience.* PhD Dissertation. United States: The University of Wisconsin.
- Bahns, M. K. 2005. *Rural to Urban Migration in Developing Countries: The Applicability of Harries Todaro Model with a Special Focus on the Chinese Economy.* Dissertation zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades des Doctors der Wirt chafts Wissens chaften ander Unversity at Konstanz.
- Becker, C., A., Hamer, and A. Marrison. 1994. *Beyond Urban Bias in Africa: Urbanization in an Era of Structural Adjustment,* London, Heinemann.
- Berhan Asmame. 2011. *The Cause and Consequence of Rural Urban migration in Woldia town of Ethiopia.* MA in Geography, South Africa University.
- Bethlehem Tecola. 2005. *Poverty and the Social Context of Sex Work in Ethiopia.* Addis Ababa: Forum for Social Studies.
- Clark, W.A.V. 1986. *Human Migration.* Beverly Hills: SAGE publications.
- Central Statistical Agency(CSA). 1999. *The 1994 Population and Housing Census of Ethiopia: Results at Country Level Volume 2, Analytical Report,* Addis Ababa: Central Statistical Authority.
- CSA. 2007. *Population and Housing Census.* Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Central Statistical Agency.

- CSA. 2011. Analytical Report on Population Size and Characteristics: The 2007 Population and Housing Census of Ethiopia, Results at Country Level, Central Statistical Agency. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Office of Population and Housing Census, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Dana E. Hunnes MPH, R. D. 2013. Understanding Rural-to-Urban Migration in Ethiopia: Driving Factors, Analytical Frameworks, and Recommendations (Review). First Aid Worldwide.
- Haan, de. A. 2000. Migrants, Livelihoods, and Rights: The Relevance of Migration Development Policies. DFID, Social Development Working Paper No. 4. Social Development Department.
- Haas, de. H. 2007. Remittances, Migration and Social Development, A Conceptual Review of the Literature, Social Policy and Development, Programme Paper Number 34, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, October 2007.
- Dessalegn Rahmato. 1984. Agrarian Reform in Ethiopia. Trenton, N.J.: Red Sea Press.
- Dejene Aredo. 2005. Migration Remittances, Shocks, and Poverty in Urban Ethiopia: An Analysis of Micro Level Panel Data. Addis Ababa University.
- EIA. 1999/2000. Annual Report on the Ethiopian Economy, Vol.1, Addis Ababa: Ethiopian Economic Association.
- Ells, F. and Harris, N. 2004. Keynote Paper, New Thinking about Urban and Rural Development, DFID Sustainable Development Retreat, Guildford, University of Surrey.
- Ethiopia Demographic Profile. 2012. Urbanization. Available from: http://www.indexmundi.com/ethiopia/demographics_profile.html. Retrieved on 24/10/2012.
- Feyera Abdissa and Terefe Degefa. 2011. Urbanization and Changing Livelihoods: The Case of Farmers' Displacement in the Expansion of Addis Ababa (pp. 215-236): In Charles Teller and Assefa Hailemariam (eds.): The Demographic Transition and Development in Africa; The Unique Case of Ethiopia (Foreword by William Butz), Springer.

- Gashew Teshome. 2002. Patterns, Causes and Consequence of Urban-ward Migration in Kombolcha Town of Ethiopia. MA in Geography, Addis Ababa University.
- Gebrehiwot Weldegebrail Gebru and Fekadu Beyene. 2012. Causes and consequences of out-migration on rural households' livelihood in Gulomekeda district, Tigray, Ethiopia. *Agricultural Research and Reviews* Vol. 1(1):26 – 33.
- Gete Zeleke, Woldie Asfaw and Degefa Tolossa. 2010. Causes and impacts of seasonal migration on rural livelihoods: Case studies from Amhara Region in Ethiopia. *Norwegian Journal of Geography* 64: 58-70.
- Gilbert. K. 1992. Cities, Poverty and Development; Urbanization in the Third World. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gugler, J. 1988. The Urbanization of Third World. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Helmsing, A. H. J. 2000. Rural and Urban Relations and Adjustments: A Review. Working Paper, Regional and Local Development Studies, Addis Ababa University.
- IFAD. 2008. Migration, Remittances and Rural Development. Available at <http://www.ifad.org/pub/remittances/migration.pdf>. Accessed on October 13, 2013.
- Julie P. 2004. Introduction to Statistics and Data Analysis. Open University, McGraw-Hill.
- Kabir, S. and Haider, U. 2010. Factors of Migration on Urban Bangladesh: An Empirical Study of Poor Migrants in Rajshahi City. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)*, Vol. 30(2):307-323.
- Kasahun Asres. 2000. Migration to Addis Ababa: An Explanation of Reasons for Migration and Employment Status at the Destination. Addis Ababa, Addis Ababa University, Unpublished M.Sc Thesis.
- Kebede Mamo. 1994. Migration and Urbanization in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education, Institute for Curriculum Development and Research (ICDR).
- Kojima, R.1996. Introduction: Population, Migration and Urbanization in Developing Countries. *The Developing Economies*. Vol. 34, WILEY: Online library.

- Lindsay, B. 1985. African Migration and National Development. USA.
- Markos Ezra. 2001. Ecological Degradation, Rural poverty and Migration in Ethiopia; Contextual Analysis. Population Council.
- Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoFED). 2007. Plan for Accelerated and Sustainable Development to End Poverty (PASDEP). Five Years National Development Plan 2005/06-2009/10. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Finance and Economic Development.
- Mohammed Abdu. 2006. The Causes and Consequences of Migration in Tigray Region of Ethiopia: MA in Regional and Local Development Studies, Addis Ababa University.
- Mohammed Seraje. 2007. Livelihood strategies and their implications for rural-urban linkages: The case of Wolenkomi town and the surrounding rural kebeles. Working papers on population and land use change in central Ethiopia, nr. 10, Series No. 18. Acta Geographica-Trondheim: NATU and Addis Ababa University.
- Nadi Dukem. 2012. Central Industry Ethiopia of Dukem. Unpublished Report, Addis Ababa.
- Newman J.L. 1984. Population Patterns, Dynamics and Prospects. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Oromia Urban Planning Institute (OUPI) (2008). Oromia National Regional State Structure Plan of Dukem Town. Unpublished Report. Addis Ababa.
- Pankhurst, A. and Feleke Tadele. 2005. Migration and Wellbeing in Ethiopia: Evidence from case studies in urban and rural sites. Migration and Wellbeing – Initial findings. Wellbeing in Developing Countries, Economic and Social Research Council. University of Bath, UK.
- Peil, M. and P. O. Sada. 1985. African Urban Society. Social Development in the Third World. USA.
- Qin, Hua. 2010. Rural-to-Urban Labour Migration, Household Livelihoods, and the Rural Environment in Chongqing Municipality, Southwest China. *Human Ecology* 38(675-690). Springer

- Smit, A. 2011. Impacts of rural-urban migration on rural migrant households in the surroundings of Kigali. How migration affects their livelihoods. Master Thesis MSc International Development Studies (IDS), Faculty of Geosciences, University of Utrecht.
- Stark, Oded. and D.E. Bloom. 1985. The New Economics of Labour Migration. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 75(2):173-178.
- Sundari, S. 2005. Migration as a Livelihood Strategy: A Gender Perspective. *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol.40 (22/23):2295-2303.
- Timalsina, K. P. 2007. Rural Urban Migration and Livelihood in the Informal Sector. Department of Geography, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NYNU), Trondheim, Norway.
- Todaro, M. P. 1989. Economic Development in Third World, fourth edition, New York. Ravenstein, E.G. 1985. The Law of Migration. *Journal of Royal Statistical Society*.
- United Nations (UN) 1999. Population Growth, Structures and Distribution: The Concise Report. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations Permanent Forum for Indigenous Issues, (nd.) Urban Indigenous Peoples and Migration: Challenges and Opportunities. Indigenous Peoples Indigenous Voices, Sixth Session of the UN Permanent Forum for Indigenous Issues, United Nations. Available at [Http://www.un.org/esa/sacdev/unfii/en/session_sixth.html](http://www.un.org/esa/sacdev/unfii/en/session_sixth.html). Accessed on Oct. 12/2013.
- Waddington, C. 2003. Livelihood Outcomes of Migration for Poor People. Working Paper T1. Development Research Centre on Migration, Globalization and Poverty. Sussex Centre for Migration Research.
- Wills, K. 2010. Introduction: Mobility, Migration and Development. *IDPR*, 32(3-4):1-13.
- Zhao.Y. 1999. Labour Migration and Earnings Differences: The Case of Rural China. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Vol. 47(4): 767-782.